

Task Force For Selecting New Children's Instruments

Synopsis of April 3, 2001 Meeting

A meeting of the Task Force for Selecting New Children's Performance Outcome Instruments was held on Tuesday, April 3, 2001, at the Sacramento Airport Host Hotel. The topics of discussion and the actions that were recommended are highlighted below.

- **Welcoming Remarks and Introductions** – Jim Higgins, Department of Mental Health (DMH), led introductions and reviewed the agenda. Representatives from the following counties were present: Astrid Beigel (Los Angeles County); Gary Spicer (Alameda County); Tracy Herbert, Uma Zykofsky and Sue Farley (Sacramento County); Rudy Arrieta and Richard Sanguinetti (San Joaquin County); Deborah Sherwood (San Francisco County); Chris McCauley (Santa Cruz County); Mark Morrison, Brenda Kachel and Carol Adams (Stanislaus County); Mike Parmley (Kern County); and Karen Brown (Sutter-Yuba County). Ann Arneill-Py and Karen Hart represented the California Mental Health Planning Council. Luis Zanartu and Chuck Anders represented the DMH Children's System of Care. Sherrie Sala-Moore and Brenda Golladay represented the DMH Research and Performance Outcomes Development (RPOD).

- **Pilot County Report** – Participating counties present at the Task Force meeting presented an update of their current implementation status:

Sacramento: No problems or comments at this time.

Alameda: Alameda added a more "severely" impaired site to the pilot study. This site should add about 40 more clients to the data set.

Los Angeles: Los Angeles county implemented the pilot study on April 1 and had no issues to report.

San Joaquin: San Joaquin county reported that the pilot study is going smooth and there has been quite a bit of positive support.

Stanislaus: Stanislaus mentioned that a new analyst has just been hired for the children's system. Clinicians continue to be "happy" with the pilot study. A total of 52 instruments have been submitted and new groups have been trained. It was mentioned that an immediate goal is to follow up on the "excitedness" with reports and feedback for the clinicians completing the instruments.

Kern: Kern county stated that the pilot study continues to run smoothly and that they are getting started on the evaluation component.

Sutter/Yuba: Sutter/Yuba county stated that clinicians "love" the forms because they are easier to complete. In addition, a better tracking system has been developed that allows clinicians to easily find out which instruments need to be completed.

Counties were informed that they should contact Sherrie Sala-Moore if they would like to receive their data in either an SPSS or Access format.

- **Follow-Up On Any Data Issues** – DMH distributed reports that reflected problems with the raw data. Counties can fix these problems and submit the corrections to either Brenda Golladay or Roxane Gomez. It is important to note that knowing what data is “bad” could be helpful because it is part of the pilot process.

In addition, to aid in the analysis of the Pilot Study data, DMH is requesting that counties submit a short description of each of the programs that are involved in the Pilot Study. These reports should include information about the clients (e.g., level of impairment) as well as a description of the services being provided. It would also be helpful if counties could provide information of the different page links that were assigned to the different programs. DMH requests that these reports be submitted by **May 11, 2001**.

Counties requested that they be sent Time 2 packets as soon as possible. At this time, DMH will only create and distribute a limited number of Time 2 packets due to the fact that mass distribution is pending the completion of the Youth Services Survey for Families (YSS-F) instrument. This instrument is expected to be completed by the end of April 2001.

- **Summary of Pilot Data By Age Groupings, Level of Services and Level of Severity Ratings (CAFAS & Ohio Scales)** – After reviewing a Power Point Presentation on the pilot study data, Task Force members made the following comments:
 - Thus far, African American clients seem to be underrepresented in the data set. It is important to try to sample more clients from this population.
 - It would be interesting to look at the risk factors broken down by the agency involved in providing services.
 - It looks like the clinicians are doing a pretty good job at trying to answer the risk factor questions.
 - The Ohio Problem scale seems to be picking out more severe clients than the CAFAS. Some Task Force members questioned why the Ohio scales are even being compared to the CAFAS since it does not make sense to compare two instruments that measure different constructs. DMH asserted that it is important to know if the Ohio scales are as good as the CAFAS at identifying the more impaired clients and that evidence of comparability (correlation) between the existing and proposed systems.
 - It does not make sense to look at the data by placement and diagnosis.
 - It would be valuable to get cost by the “mild”, “moderate”, and “severe” classifications. It is important to keep in mind, though, that it might cost more money.
- **Update on Additional Risk Factor Prevalence Rate Data from Literature Reviews** – DMH presented an updated literature review that was conducted to identify the prevalence of risk factors in the general population.
- **Revision of CLESP Reference Sheet** – The Client Living Environment and Stability Profile (CLESP) Reference Sheet was revised. Changes were as follows:
 - Stability Information: remove “there should be at least one placement”.
 - Group Home: remove the Department of Social Services definitions.
 - School Attendance: remove the provided example because it is too confusing.

- **Topics To Be Discussed at the Next Children's Task Force Meeting**
 - ✓ Report on Pilot County progress
 - ✓ Follow up on any data issues
 - ✓ Review summary pilot data
- **Next Meeting - Sacramento Airport Host Hotel, American Room**

June 5, 2001
10:00 AM – 3:00 PM